

**REMARKS**

**DRAWINGS**

The drawings were objected to as not including the reference numeral 611 and Fig. 5 should be designated as PRIOR ART.

Being filed concurrently herewith is a letter requesting approval of changes to the drawings which it is being requested that the numeral 611 be added to Fig. 6 and that Fig. 5 be designated as PRIOR ART.

It is also being requested that Figs. 1 and 2 be amended to extend the lead lines from the numerals 302 and 202, respectively, to the proper element in accordance with the description set forth in the specification.

It is requested that these changes to the drawings be approved.

**SPECIFICATION AND ABSTRACT**

The specification was objected to for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 4 on pages 2 and 3 of the Action.

All of the changes requested by the Examiner to the specification have been made by this amendment except that the Applicant does not believe that the word "rotate" should be added before --CCW-- in line 1 on page 10. It is believed

that the last line on page 9 and the first line on page 10 are proper as set forth. Specifically, this portion states "...a closing plunger 111 rotates the closing trigger hook 109 CCW so as to disengage the closing trigger hook 109..." It is believe clear from this quoted portion that it is not necessary to insert the word "rotates" before --CCW--.

In addition to the changes requested by the Examiner, Applicants have carefully reviewed the specification and have made a number of other changes to correct inadvertent typographical errors and/or otherwise improve its form.

The abstract has also been amended to improve its form.

No new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification and abstract.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS AND REJECTIONS**

Claims 8 and 9 were objected to because of certain informalities as set forth in numbered paragraph 5, on page 3 of the Action.

Claims 1, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Peek et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,027,125 for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 6, on pages 3 and 4 of the Action.

Claims 3 and 5-1 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peek et al. in view of Opfer et al.

U.S. Patent No. 5,398,704 for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 7, on pages 4 and 5 of the Action.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peek et al. in view of Goodwin, Jr. et al. U.S. Patent No. 3,932,719 for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 8, on page 5 of the Action.

Claims 2, 4 and 5/2 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 10, on pages 5 and 6 of the Action.

By this amendment, original claims 1, 3 and 5-9 have been cancelled and claims 2-4 previously were cancelled in the Preliminary Amendment filed with the application on July 30, 2003. Accordingly, all the above noted objections and rejections are no longer applicable.

**PATENTABILITY OF NEW CLAIM 10**

New claim 10 generally includes the limitations of original claims 6 and 7 and at least the following two limitations:

(a) "said shock absorber comprises a piston, a rod end, and a breaking spring guide;"

(b) "said shock absorber is arranged in a breaking spring of said breaking section."

It is submitted that new claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gene W. Stockman  
Registration No. 21,021  
Attorney for Applicant

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: May 20, 2004